

## REMARKS

Claims 17-29 remain in this application. Claims 1-16 were previously canceled. Reconsideration of the application is requested.

A copy of a Notification of Missing Requirements, showing a November 15, 2001, date mailed, is attached to this Reply. Receipt of the priority document necessary to perfect the claim for foreign priority made in the present application is acknowledged in this Notification, and there is no requirement to file the certified copy referred to in the first paragraph appearing on page 2 of the Office Action.

The informalities in the disclosure mentioned on page 2 of the Office Action are eliminated above.

The claim amendments set forth above are made following consideration of the comments provided on page 3-4 of the Office Action. It is respectfully submitted that the claims of this application are now in proper form.

Reconsideration of the rejections of claims 17-29 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first and second paragraphs, set forth on pages 4-8 is requested. It is respectfully submitted that, after entry of the amendments appearing above, all claims in this application comply with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112.


Reconsideration of the provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection set forth on page 9 is requested. No claim of the present application defines depositing a platinum/ruthenium mixture from a sulphuric acid solution containing platinum and ruthenium as catalytically active material, with the particularly required 1:10 to 1:20 Pt:Ru ratio, as does claim 1 of published U.S. Patent Application

Publication US 2002/0052292 A1 to Dahlhoff et al. Nothing properly relied on by the Examiner, moreover, suggests modifying claim 1 of the Dahlhoff et al. publication to eliminate either the specified Pt/Ru depositing operation or the recited Pt:Ru ratio. All claims of the present application are patentably distinct from both claim 1 of the Dahlhoff et al. publication and claims 2-15 of the Dahlhoff et al. publication, which depend on claim 1. The provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection based on the claims of the Dahlhoff et al. publication should be withdrawn.

This application is in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner have any questions after considering this Reply, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned attorney.

Date: February 5, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

  
Richard R. Diefendorf  
Registration No. 32,390

CROWELL & MORING LLP  
P.O. Box 14300  
Washington, D.C. 20044-4300  
Telephone No.: (202) 624-2500  
Facsimile No.: (202) 628-8844  
RRD:msy